A&S Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance
Meeting Notes
Friday, January 27, 2017
Present: Goddu, McCulley, Abreu

Interviews with Dr. Jane Geaney (Grievance Committee) and Dr. Yvonne Howell (Tenure and Promotion Committee)

DAC and Academic Council
There seems to be an overlap and some confusion between the roles of DAC and AC. They are sometimes played against each other. What is the Dean’s power relationship to DAC? What is DAC’s role – advice to the Dean? Does the Dean really need the advice? Is DAC spending time on questions, research and decisions that may be overruled or agreed upon before research on various issues takes place?

We had a conversation about the dual representation on Planning and Priorities and DAC. If you are elected to P and P, then you serve on DAC as well. Both involve a lot of work and time. P and P is often a “rubber stamp,” and “finance” really runs it. Is this effective use of faculty time? Examining the function of these two committees to make sense and make a difference is very important.

Participation on A&S Committees
How can we broaden participation in A&S committee work? We seem to elect the same people to committees over and over again. Rotations on committees produce healthier working groups and fresh ideas.

In addition, concern was expressed that many committees were not doing anything useful or significant. Committee members need to fully understand reporting procedures or how their committee’s work moved elsewhere in the chain of getting things done.

Grievance Committee
A&S probably needs its own grievance committee since it is a bigger school and has different issues. The current grievance committee structure involves all five schools.
**A&S Faculty Meetings**

There is low turnout at faculty meetings. Faculty are not that well-informed and don’t understand how decisions are made. It is also unfortunate that Academic Council and faculty meetings are basically the same, so those that attend AC (Department Chairs and Program Coordinators) often do not attend faculty meetings.

**By-Laws**

A&S needs by-laws to operate effectively.

We need to address the inconsistencies for T&P in the Faculty Handbook, A&S Dean’s Guidelines, and the Appendix for A&S. They should not conflict.

We need to address how to turn an interdisciplinary program into a department. How to hire an ID professor at the pre-tenure level? How to propose a new ID program? Nothing is in writing about these processes.

**Curriculum**

General Education curriculum? Where does that start, who takes responsibility, etc.? We need a structure on how to change the curriculum. How (from the point of view of A&S governance and structures) – would we even begin to replace our current Gen Ed system (consisting of 6 fields-of-study and so forth) with a fundamentally different system (for instance, themed pathways, consisting of courses across disciplinary areas around a given problem; or, as some of the wording in the Strategic Plan draft says “integrated, four-year Gen Ed system” (as opposed to our current set of discipline-introduction courses). In short, if the Strategic Plan prompts a search for a university-wide revision of the entire Gen Ed structure, where/what is the mechanism that will allow for faculty participation and leadership in how this happens?

A strong A&S shared governance system would help us deal with such issues of revising the curriculum, improving the course creation and
approval process, as well as dealing with curriculum issues with the other schools, cross-school initiatives, etc.